CHARLES PETTIT McILVAINE
AND
THE EVANGELICAL MOVEMENT

BY

GILBERT PARKER PRINCE

Library of the
Church Divinity School
of the Pacific

No. 16638 Class ZT P955
Ex Dono Author
Date 1940

CHARLES PETTIT MCILVAINE AND THE EVANGELICAL MOVEMENT

By

Gilbert Parker Prince
B.A. Occidental College, 1937, Los Angeles, California.

A THESIS

Submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements
of the degree of

BACHELOR OF DIVINITY

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF CHURCH HISTORY,

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC

Berkeley, California.

May, 1940.

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY 1962

Approved: Henry M. Shires
Instructor

Henry M. Shires
Dean

Filed: April 5, 1940 W. M. Shires, Lib'n
Date

Thesis
Cage
1940

ZT
P955

CONTENTS

16638

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

https://archive.org/details/charlespettitmci00unse

CONTENTS

1. An introduction to the Evangelical Movement. Page 1

2. The early life and background of Bishop McIlvaine. " 7

   (a) McIlvaine's early ministry.
   (b) His election and consecration as Bishop of Ohio.

3. The influences of Tractarianism. " 17

4. Evangelicalism and Tractarianism. " 22

5. Bishop McIlvaine's relationships with England. " 32

6. The writings of Bishop McIlvaine. " 39

7. Closing years of McIlvaine's life. " 45

8. McIlvaine's contribution to the Church. " 48

9. Bibliography.

10. Appendix.

CHAPTER ONE

Three reasons lie behind the choice of this subject: Charles Pettit McIlvaine and the Evangelical Movement; (1) The fact that there is no extended work on this aspect of Bishop McIlvaine's life, (2) The apparent need of some study of the Low Church traditions of the ninteenth Century, (3) The fact that I have access to special correspondence of Bishop McIlvaine now in the hands of Mrs. W. B. Stevens and in the library of Kenyon College.

By the Evangelical Movement I mean that tradition which was represented by the Anglican clergy, who after the Wesleyan Revival were content to remain Anglicans and yet who retained the fervency of spirit and profound convictions of those who had left.

According to Leonard E. Binns "The name Evangelical had already, even in the eighteenth Century a long and varied history behind it. It had been applied to Wycliffe and his followers, as well as to the Reformers, both on the Continent and here in England. As early as 1531 Sir Thomas More declares that, 'Those Evangelicalles themselves cease not to pursue and punish their bretherne.'" It is assumed that the term, Evangelical, referred at first to certain types of doctrine, hence "from the teaching to the preachers themselves." Accordingly, Binns classifies the development of this movement as follows: (a) From the beginning to the Oxford Movement; (b) From the Oxford Movement to the

eighties; (c) From the eighties to the present day.[1]

Actually, the Evangelical Movement was the result of that great Methodist Revival of the eighteenth Century, which "had come like a breath of the Spirit of God into a hopeless and fainting world...it came without organization and almost without expectation."[2]

Speaking of the era of Walpole (1714-1740) Patterson says, that if it was "one of great material progress, it was one of spiritual and moral decay. It has been well described as 'an age destitute of depth or earnestness, an age whose poetry was without romance, whose philosophy was without insight, and whose public men were without character...whose very merits were of the earth, earthy.' The Church of England fell into a state of lethargic stupor, and it seems that the gates of hell would prevail against her."[3]

As to the contributing causes of such a fallen state several major ones stand forth prominently. The enthusiasm of the seventeenth Century had been spent. As the pendulum swung in the opposite direction the storms of political and religious controversy gave away to a calm of mental and moral indifference. The Jacobite type of clergyman became an inviting target for satire; the learned Bishops were staunch

1. Binns, L. E., The Evangelical Movement in the English Church, P.2 ff.
2. Binns, L. E., Op. Cit. P. 3
3. Patterson, M. W., A History of the Church of England P.380

Erastians. As the outcome of the so-called Bangorian controversy Convocation was suppressed from 1717-1852. With the ascension of George III, (1760), a wave of materialism had swept over the country. Obscenity and immorality followed as a matter of course, as did crime. True it is that the Deists had been vanquished, but the conditions remained unchanged.

Confronted by these conditions, John Wesley struck the note of that revival which was to encircle the earth.

"In those days the Wesleyan and Evangelical movements were one; the modern Evangelical party derived its origin from the Methodists who remained within the pale of the historic Church."[1] The split among the Evangelical Anglicans was not caused by the freedom or informality of the latter, but primarily by a difference in theology. The Evangelical Anglicans, followed Whitfield, the Calvinist, and Huntington rather than John Wesley, in spite of the fact that Wesley was more devoted to the Church than either of the others.[2] The difference was manifested in their answer to two questions: (1) Are certain numbers predestined to a special way of life? (2) Is it possible to attain sinless perfection here? The Wesleyans followed the Arminian tradition while the Anglican Evangelicals were essentially Calvinistic.

As to methods of operation a new departure was to be found in Methodism. Lecky, the English historian, says,

1. Patterson, M. W., Op.Cit. P 391
2. Overton and Relton, History of the English Church Vol. 7 P 173 f.

"The doctrines the Methodist taught, the theory of life he enforced, proved themselves capable of arousing in great masses of men an enthusiasm of piety....hardly surpassed in the first days of Christianity."[1] For the sake of administering to the "needy and neglected souls" Wesley disregarded parochial boundaries and evangelized great tracts of land. Manross clarifies the motive by the following statement:

"Since conversion was necessary...., was dependent on and primarily the result of divine grace it was not absolutely predetermined....it followed that it was the duty of the pastor to do everything in his power to make people seek it and to bring them to the state of mind in which they would be most likely to receive it."[2] It is agreed that John Wesley found it expedient to preach emotionally and to hold classes for religious instruction on the Bible, using a combined form of preaching and prayer. Among other things the traditional importance of the Sacraments was minimized as the personal aspect of conversion, as such, was stressed. This affected his conception of the rite of baptism and the Eucharist. Baptismal regeneration, as a doctrine, lost its external strength as regeneration was conceived of as an inner, or personal act. Holy Communion was thought of as a commemorative meal and episcopacy was tenable, but not

1. Binns,L. E., Op.Cit. P 7.
2. Manross, W. W., A History of the American Episcopal Church. P 215

necessarily valid. Gospel truth was preferred to the traditions of the Church, and self-indulgence was the work of Satanic temptation.

The Wesleyan point of view provided the general background of the Evangelical Movement in Anglicanism and resulted in a morbid and gloomy emphasis and a certain indifference to scholarship. "Doctrines were preached and taught without qualification. The preachers appealed to the common people and did not trouble themselves with the reservations the more scholarily audience would expect to hear."[1] It was primarily individualistic. Social interest of such a group as the Clapham sect cannot be ignored, but to most of the Evangelicals a corporate aspect of religion meant little, so little that with many the ministry in the Established Church was a matter of conscience and not conviction.[2] By degrees the Evangelical movement and the Church of England became more closely identified. The writings of the Tractarians put the Evangelicals on the defensive. Their point of view became more or less fixed. Reflecting the Wesleyan Revival the Evangelicals believed that all Salvation came from the free and merciful Grace of God. "Faith was to be exercised by every man; the movement of this consciousness was defined as conversion...man had within himself a witness of the spirit that he was saved....the ultimate source of Truth was to be found in Holy Scripture, the verbal inspiration of

1. Overton and Relton, Op.Cit. PP 154, 245, 248
2. Ibid P 230

which they fully believed."[1]

The American Church was naturally affected by all this and in the Bishops Hobart and Griswold, consecrated in 1811, the two dominant types of Anglican Churchmanship were represented, namely High Churchmanship and Evangelicalism. Hobart was not merely a leader of the former, but what has been called a "redesigner" having given to it a personal warmth, heretofore unknown.

Griswold, on the other hand, from the beginning, allied his position with that of the Evangelicals and under his Episcopal over-sight, the Eastern Diocese reflected his strong, personal convictions. His first effort was to rekindle religious fervor, without using emotional extravagances. The first year of his episcopate he administered Confirmation to over 1200 candidates. During his life as Bishop of the Eastern Diocese he saw 22 parishes multiplyed five-fold. Such a rapid expansion as was experienced under Bishop Griswold has been attributed to his cool, deliberate type of Evangelicalism.

For the most part, the Evangelicals were anti-Roman Catholic. After the beginning of the Tractarian Movement much of their concern was to correct what they believed to be the errors of the Oxford Movement. By the latter part of the Nineteenth Century much of the Evangelical emphasis was directed against the rising tide of the ceremonial of the Catholic Revival and today, it is a strong agency for conservatism.

1. Overton and Relton, Op.Cit. P 154

CHAPTER TWO

Charles Pettit McIlvaine was born at Burlington, New Jersey, January 8, 1799. This was 34 years before Keble's famous Assize sermon. Evangelical traditions were dominant in both the Church of England and in the American Episcopal Church. McIlvaine's tradition and ancestry were Scotch and presumably Calvinist. In his childhood he attended the worship of the Episcopal Church in Burlington. In his own notes he records his Church relationships then: "My dear Mother having some scruples about presenting her children for baptism as long as she was not a communicant (afterwards she became one) I was not baptized until my college course, when having been turned to the Lord, by His Grace, I presented myself for Baptism in St. Mary's Church, Burlington and received that sacrament at the hands of Dr. Horton."[1]

He was graduated from Princeton in the Fall of 1816. At that time the Episcopal Church had no seminary of its own. The General Seminary was just in its beginning. For a year after graduation from college he remained at home engaged in private study and reading. In September, 1817, he entered the theological seminary at Princeton. His health failed in the middle of his second year and he remained there in all about 16 months. He stated that his course of study "involved nothing distinctive of the Presbyterian Church"[2] and yet it must be assumed that the Princeton of that day would have

1. Carus, William, Memorials of Charles Pettit McIlvaine P.9
2. Ibid P. 10

been almost militantly Presbyterian and Calvinistic.

Many years afterward he described his religious experience at Princeton in the following terms:

"It is more than fifty years since I first witnessed a revival of religion. It was in the college of which I was a student. It was powerful and prevailing and fruitful in the conversion of young men to God; it was quiet, unexcited and entirely free from all devices or means beyond the few which God has appointed, namely prayer and the ministry of the Word. In that previous season of the power of God my religious life began. I had heard before; I began then to know. I must doubt the deepest convictions of my soul, when I doubt whether that revival was the work of the Spirit of God."[1]

Still later he passed through an experience which may have been characteristic of many of the early Evangelicals.

"I think it was just after, or a little before I graduated from college, when I was between seventeen and eighteen years of age, and about a year or eighteen months after I had been turned to the Lord, I was at my father's house at Burlington, New Jersey. Conscious of the immaturity of my religious character and feeling the need of special sessions of prayer (there being at that time in that town scarcely any intelligent, earnest Christian society to help me) I had a rule of going each evening at the setting of the sun to my chamber for prayer. One afternoon as that hour approached, I was sitting in the parlour with some company

1. Carus, Op. Cit. P. 11

that had just come in. Presently I said to myself, 'The sun is low. Go to your room.' But I answered to myself, 'They will go directly and I will wait'. I waited a very short time and was conscious that as I waited the disposition to go decreased. I said to myself, 'I had better go at once' and arose and went. I had no sooner got out of the parlour into the hall, where I was to ascend the staircase, than an indescribable dread came over me as if some mysterious agency of terror were resisting me. I began the ascent by force. As I went up the dread increased to such an extent that I trembled in every limb and perspiration broke out at every pore. I took hold of the bannister and dragged myself up. By the time I had reached the first landing (my room was on the second story) I was so overpowered with dread, that I stopped and considered whether I go farther. What it was I did not attempt to examine. All I knew was that some power, some darkness, some unutterable dread was upon me and before me....I stood for a moment whether I dare open the door. I opened and rushed to the chair at which I was accustomed to kneel at the other side of the room. I knelt and in broken sentences prayed; two or three times looking behind me as if I expected to see some being there....I arose and instantly the whole dread began to vanish away as a cloud. In a few moments it was all gone."[1]

McIlvaine was ordained Deacon by Bishop White in St.

1. Carus, Op. Cit. P. 13 ff.

Peter's Church, Philadelphia. July 4, 1820.[1] His first work was at Georgetown, D.C. as deacon. During his term at Christ's Church he was elected chaplain of the United States Senate and was its youngest Chaplain. On January 28, 1825, he was appointed Chaplain and professor of ethics at West Point. Military men at Washington tried to discourage him from accepting. He was told he would find widespread dissension from his Evangelical preaching. He accepted, however, and it was with some dread and alarm that he left for West Point, where he began his work in the Spring of 1825. His predecessor had been a Presbyterian and McIlvaine's first responsibility was to introduce the Prayer Book Service. This apparently was accomplished without difficulty, but McIlvaine decided his Evangelical approach could not and should not be modified.

"I determined to know my military and scientific congregation as differing in no respect so far as the current character of my preaching was concerned, from any other congregation. I would remember that they were only to give a certain incidental direction sometimes to what I said; but they were sinners, lost sinners, with hearts and consciences and wants like all others; they needed the same Savior, the same Gospel and the same manifestation of truth as others....

1. There seems to be some error as to the exact day. June 25, has been suggested. July 4, is given by the Bishop himself. Carus P. 16.

On this I rested for such effects....as would develop character and enable me to know the minds of my hearers."[1]

One Sunday he heard some junior officers walking behind him and discussing his sermons. One of them said, "It is getting hotter and hotter." During the first year there was little evidence of any response. Gradually cadets began to come to him. He held office hours during the week day and many of these same men filled his room.[2] Many of these became Clergymen of great distinction. His direct methods and his success were unacceptable to the authorities of the academy, and in 1827 he was relieved of his position. In the meantime he had become widely and favorably known, and he at once received several calls to churches. He was already regarded as a champion of Evangelical views. The Reverend Henry Onderdonk, however, called him only "half a Churchman", in a letter which was to discourage a certain Church from calling him. McIlvaine wrote a pamphlet defending himself and had the satisfaction of being called to succeed Onderdonk at St. Anne's, New York.

McIlvaine remained at St. Anne's four years and during that time was professor of Revealed Evidences at the University of the city of New York, now New York University. The lectures he delivered while there were considered to be the best in that field at the time. His diary during his stay

1. Carus P. 25 ff.
2. Smythe, G. F., A History of the Diocese of Ohio P. 179

at St. Anne's reveals much of his theological position. After the birth of Emily, his daughter, he made the following entry:

"I desire and pray, O Thou God and Father of us all, that I may most deeply feel what a most precious trust thou hast committed to me - what a solemn charge I have to keep; what an awful responsibility I have to sustain. Give me faith to look to thee for help, guidance and a blessing in all my efforts to bring up thy dear children in thy faith and love; I would feel my utter inability to guide and protect them in such a world as this. They have inherited the same depraved nature which I and all mankind have inherited as the curse of original sin and the consequence of the original covenant representative of our race. They must be born again or they cannot see the Kingdom of God."[1]

In 1830 McIlvaine made his first visit to England. This was the beginning of many visits to England and many close contacts with the Church of England and with the Evangelicals of the Establishment. He was impressed by the piety of the laymen and met Lords Gambier, Bexley, Lorton, Mount Sanford, and military and naval officers. Often, of the latter he spoke, "No clergy could have spoken more boldly, spiritually, ardently and Evangelically over such men as us."[2] He breakfasted at the home of Bishop Daniel Wilson (afterwards Bishop

1. Carus, Op.Cit. P 33
2. Ibid P. 45

of Calcutta), at Islington.

"The breakfast was at ten. The Dean of Salisbury and the Chaplains of the Bishops of Winchester and Chester were there. After breakfast we all went into the library and held a clerical prayer-meeting. I declined taking part... Dr. Milnor, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Stewart, and Mr. Darby expounded; Mr. Noel, Mr. Dallas, and another prayed. It was a precious meeting. On what a spirit annimates these men!"[1]

In the year of 1831 he received calls to St. Thomas' Church, New York, and St. Paul's Church, Boston; it was while he was giving his earnest consideration to these calls that he was selected as Bishop to succeed Bishop Chase.[2]

In 1831 he was elected Bishop of Ohio. His position as a leader of Evangelical opinion was unquestioned, both in this country and in England. Evangelicals were in the majority in the Diocese of Ohio, and they naturally turned to him as their choice of Bishop. Bishop Chase had left the Diocese and had resigned; and concerning the validity of that resignation questions were raised. Subsequently it was a year before McIlvaine's election was confirmed by General Convention. However, in 1832 he was consecrated Bishop of Ohio, in St. Paul's Chapel, New York.

McIlvaine undertook the task with some hesitation; he had never been strong, nor had he ever left the Eastern coast. He was naturally reserved and austere. He was con-

1. Carus, Op.Cit. P. 46
2. Lee, Alfred, In Memoriam P. 13

sidered distant and even haughty.

"As Bishop of Ohio, he must endure hardness, journeying up and down in a country, many parts of which were still a forest and a wilderness where conditions were primative and rude. Much of the journeyings must be done on horseback, or in a carriage and he must often find lodging and meals in crowded, dirty taverns. It is probable that during his first twelve years in Ohio Bishop McIlvaine encountered as much hardship as did Bishop Chase in the twelve years of his Episcopate here."[1]

The temperament and hardships of the Bishop have some relation to his later difficulties and differences of opinion in the Diocese of Ohio. Had he faced some of his problems under the easier conditions of the Atlantic seaboard, he might have found them of a much easier adjustment. In part, when he seemed haughty and overbearing, it was likely, diffidence and lack of adjustment to the minds and language of the people with whom he was dealing. He was conscious of this himself. Writing on June 1, 1834, he said, "I acknowledge a want of my Master's Spirit, who with His quick abhorrence of all sin and quick discernment of all propriety was always so kind, acceptable, tender and benevolent to the vile and most disagreeable men. Oh, may His mind be also in me....I know that I am sadly wanting in the love and zeal becoming my office. I feel that I am not only a most unworthy sinner, but in the sight of God a most miserable bishop."

1. Smythe, Op. Cit. P. 184

It should be noted that the earlier clergy of the Diocese of Ohio were not primarily Evangelicals. Of six, three were old fashioned High Churchmen of the Connecticut type and the fourth was certainly not Evangelical.[1] By the time of McIlvaine's election a majority were undoubtedly of the Evangelical type with a small minority of High Churchmen. Hall, rector of Ashtabula, was among the latter. His parish later became one of the problem parishes of McIlvaine's episcopate. It is important to note that of the Evangelicals, not all were Evangelicals in the strict sense of the term. Many had a deep and affectionate conception of the Church as an institution as did Bishop McIlvaine, himself. In fact there were those who thought Bishop McIlvaine too High. Speaking of the laying of the cornerstone at Gambier in 1839 he said,

"We do believe that they (the principles and institutions which distinguish our Church) are primitive, derived from the apostles, of the same origin as the Bible, binding upon our consciences, and a full warrant for our standing as a separate denomination, 'till all others become Episcopal.... These things have come from the Apostles, carry the warrant of Scripture and can never be divorced from the Church of Christ without departure from the principles involved in its earliest establishment."[2]

On December 9, 1838, he preached a sermon at the Con-

1. Smythe, Op. Cit. P 249
2. Ibid. P. 230

secration of Leonidas Polk, whom he had known at West Point. His subject was the "Apostolic Commission" and it was said to have caused dissatisfaction among the Low Churchmen.

CHAPTER THREE

It may be assumed that the prevailing opinions in those Evangelical circles differed in important respects from those of the early English Evangelicals. It had a more definite, Church basis but the fundamental teaching of Justification by Faith and conversion was never forgotten.

The controversies and arguments were centered on what were regarded as Roman tendencies in ceremonial and teaching, and allegedly unscriptural tendencies on the part of the Tractarians. By 1839 the influence of the Oxford Movement had become considerable. In that year McIlvaine delivered a charge to the Clergy entitled "Justification Before God in the Righteousness of Christ Alone, Accounted Unto Us Through Faith Only". The following year he published "Oxford Divinity Compared with the Roman and Anglican Churches", a large work, the latter being the application of the former. Writing to his mother, October 1839, he said, "As soon as I get home I shall put to press a charge to the clergy delivered to the Convention on Justification with reference, especially, to the dangers to the Church, resulting from the large importations from Oxford."[1]

In July, 1843, Bishop Onderdonk ordained one Arthur Carey against strong protests that Carey had gone far towards Rome. McIlvaine laid the matter before his Convention of that year. Subsequently, a set of resolutions was passed

1. Carus, Op.Cit. P. 122

without a dissenting vote, stating that the doctrines reported to have been held by Carey "Are such in the unhesitating opinion of the Convention as should disqualify any candidate from receiving Holy Orders in the Protestant Episcopal Church" and calling for an investigation of the General Seminary, in which Carey had been trained.

Onderdonk was tried and found guilty on the charge of immoral conduct. His friends accused the Evangelicals of animus and thought in fact that he was condemned for his Tractarian views. After the trial there appeared in the New York Churchman an article signed by the members of the Vestry condemning the proceedings and attacked the Bishops who had condemned Onderdonk, one of whom was Bishop McIlvaine. The rector of St. Peter's, The Reverend John Hall, was one of the High Churchmen in the Diocese, and although he took no public part in the controversy, was sympathetic in the action taken by the vestry.

The following several years of controversy between the Bishop and vestry and the publication of "A Remonstrance of the Wardens and Vestrymen" were indicative of the latter's feelings toward McIlvaine. The Convention supported the Bishop in the matter, but it must have brought him great unhappiness as in another case in Cleveland, where the clergyman happened to be an Evangelical. At St. Paul's Columbus, Bishop McIlvaine refused to consecrate the new building unless they removed the altar and put in its place a Lord's

table (with legs). The vestry agreed to make the change without recognizing his right to interfere. Even so he agreed to consecrate the building and did so following the Convention of 1846. His opinions on this matter were stated definitely in the Diocesan Journal of 1846 in which he mentioned things which "were of formal indifference but are now of serious importance". Of that class "is that structure on which we celebrate the Supper of the Lord". Men teach "that the Lord's Supper is not a mere memory of a sacrifice but is a real propitiatory sacrifice for sin. This is popery in the essence....now where this doctrine concerning a real sacrifice and priesthood of the Eucharist exists, it must have a literal altar in the Communion because, that....is part of the very idea of the Sacrament it maintains. And it must get rid of a literal table; because that declares a very truth concerning the Sacrament as simply a commemoration feast upon a sacrifice, once offered on the Cross, which is most absolutely denied. Therefore he must refuse to consecrate any Church in which there is an altar form structure for the Lord's Supper and in which there is not a proper table in the usual sense as the permanent furniture."[1]

It was not to be expected this would meet with universal approval. The Rector of the Church at Ashtabula quoted a group of Churchmen as saying of this crisis, "An arbitrary Popish assumption of authority in putting such

1. Smythe, Op.Cit. P. 247

parishes, as do not submit to his will and dictation in regard as to what shape the altar table shall be, whether it shall be a kitchen-like or altar-like table under penalty of having their Churches stand unconsecrated."[1] Nevertheless, the Convention of 1847 adopted the following:

"Resolved that our delegates to the next General Convention be, and that they are hereby instructed to confer with the delegates to that body from other Dioceses, who are opposed to Tractarian errors, and to take such action against the same as such a consultation may indicate to be wise and expedient."[2]

Also the following:

"Resolved that in the judgement of this Convention, it is the duty of every true and consistent Churchman, to oppose in every appropriate position and by all proper means, all the essential and distinguishing features of that system of errors which is known by the name of Tractarianism."[3]

The Bishop's earlier years were marked by close attention to the affairs of Kenyon College. He was able to bring order to its rather rangled academic and financial affairs, and in 1839 from gifts obtained in England, work on Bexley Hall was begun. It stands today, a monument to his loyalty and devotion. Twice he saved Kenyon from oblivion and has been called its second founder.

1. (A letter of Hall's)
2. Smythe, Op.Cit. P. 248 ff.
3. Ibid, P. 248

The recorded difficulties of his earlier life in Ohio should have been emphasized because of their pertinence to the subject under discussion. It must not be forgotten that his earlier Episcopate was begun with great missionary success and with the development of a great missionary Diocese. Kenyon and Bexley were a center of Evangelical teaching and influence. In the Spirit of Missions, 1856, it was stated that Kenyon and Bexley stood forth as great centers of Evangelical thought and tradition and such men naturally looked toward them as central.

CHAPTER FOUR

In 1846 McIlvaine moved to Clifton near Cincinnati. From that time his associations were less close to Kenyon and Gambier. From this time on there was increased activity in Church building and an apparent improvement in Churchliness. The older Churches were not bad architecturally, yet apparently not inspiring.

"There was no recessed chancel. The flat wall extended clear across the end of the Church and against the middle of it, and standing out a few feet from it was the pulpit, often so high that it must be reached by stairs. In front of the pulpit and on a lower level stood a desk five or six feet long, at which prayers or lessons were read; and in front of that stood the Lord's Table, a true table with four legs. This was the 'three decker' introduced by Hobart in his Diocese and widely adopted in Ohio. The purpose of it was to emphasize and honor the Holy Communion by putting the Holy Table in front of everything else. Around the whole area ran a substantial rail; a door behind the pulpit, or two doors, one on each side, led into a small vestry, but in some Churches the vestry was in the basement, and was reached by a flight of stairs."[1]

In the newer buildings there was a great change. The "Three decker" began to disappear; the pulpit was on one side, the prayer desk on the other and the altar flat against the wall. The altar table was a true table with legs, with-

1. Smythe, Op. Cit. P 220

out ornaments or ecclesiastical colors. The surplice was in general use but the gown for preaching was still retained.

Bishop McIlvaine seems to have enjoyed a decade of harmony and an absence from controversy during the decade of 1850. Several quotations of a personal nature may suffice to indicate this. June 20, 1852 he wrote to his daughter from Zanesville, Ohio, in a most pronounced Evangelical note:

"My darling, this is your 'day of Salvation! this 'your youth', God says to you 'Remember me now! It is the accepted time. I dread to see you expending these precious years, which are so especially the property of God, and claimed for His love and service, and still not given to Him. Think dear N. -- --, think of the love and will of God; think how far short of your obligations to Him you have come, and do continually come! Think then of your sinfulness and condemnation! Think of dying in such a state! Endeavor to feel your need of the Spirit of God to change your heart, and of the righteousness of Christ for peace with God. Carry your state to the throne of Grace. Be not comforted, take no peace, 'til you are able to make a free consecration of yourself to God and to have a sweet hope of his mercy and salvation through Jesus."[1]

This expression of the somewhat morbid tendencies of the Evangelical point of view was apparently accompanied by a continued hatred and distrust of the Church of Rome. In spite of close acquaintanceship with Italy and apparent fondness

1. Carus, Op. Cit. P. 140 ff.

for it, this state of mind continued. The Church of Rome was always the Scarlet Woman. In October, 1858, he preached in the City of Rome; a friend, Col. F. W. Smith describes the sermon:

"The Bishop manifested deep emotional concern...he spoke of the place where they were. It was here that Martyrs had spoken and died for the testimony of the Gospel which they believed and proclaimed. Here, century after century of darkness and corruption had passed over a darkened and apostate Church. The Bishop described the Sermon as follows: 'I preached on, If any Man Thirst; not a written sermon of course. My soul was stirred within me, I preached the Gospel just as plainly and earnestly and simply as I knew how. The awful sin of Popery, and keeping sinners from Christ and filling their eyes with lies....this I could not spare.'"[1]

It is possible that a new spirit enters his letters, toward the end of this decade. 1859 seems to have been a happy year for him. Bishop Bedell, his assistant Bishop, was consecrated at the Convention. In writing to Canon Carus he comments as follows on the Convention:

"Our General Convention was very pleasant. I have never attended one so harmonious, or evincing so much religious spirit. There was at no time, on any subject a drawing of party lines....Moderate High Churchmanship (united with a manifest growth of religious spirit and with missionary zeal and with disposition to affiliate with those, whom men of extreme Church views are wont to repudiate as Churchmen) was

1. Carus, Op. Cit. P. 179

the feature of that part of the Convention, which one would not call, and which one does not desire the name Evangelical, but prefers to be called by a name more Churchly."[1]

Nevertheless, a few years later in 1866, he addressed his Convention on the subject of Ritualism in an uncompromising fashion.

"'These are very serious days' he said, 'Popery, infidelity and worliness were united to attack the camp of Gospel Truth. Here was a new portent showing that the powers of darkness were arrayed against the Church. And the portent is made more serious....by what is called the 'ritualistic movement' in the Church of England; which is simply the old Tractarian leaven of Romanism coming out with a boldness and pretension for which it has been long getting ready, and the end of which is another apostacy of so-called Protestants to Popery; leaving behind them a mixed multitude of followers so far infected with the same leaven that it will be difficult to say whether it were not better for our Church to say that they should go also. All appearances indicate a great contest approaching for the defence of "the faith once delivered to the Saints" It behoves us, dear brethern, to stand girt about with the whole armour of God.'"[2]

It was in this same year of 1866 that definite ritualistic controversies began in the American Church. Bishop J. H. Hopkins had issued a book on the subject of "Ritual Innovations" signed by 25 bishops and proclaiming the right of

1. Carus, Op. Cit. P. 194
2. Smythe, Op. Cit. P. 326 ff.

the Church to prescribe its own ritual and to condemn unauthorized vestments and ceremonies.[1] The Church was rocked by subsequent discussions and controversies.

Apparently Bishop McIlvaine was certain that none of the dangers that many earnest people feared would affect the Diocese of Ohio. In 1867 he said to his Convention:

"What I most value in the retrospect of this Diocese for the last 35 years is the strong unitedness of the stand it has ever held, decidedly of Evangelical truth and its simplicity and fairness with which it has always closed its ranks against the various errors which elsewhere have so seriously affected the doctrinal purity of our Church."[2]

As far as ritual was concerned, probably his assumption as to the general use of the ritual was correct. Incense, candles and eucharistic vestments were not in use, but in the same year (1867) the storm broke when the rector of St. Paul's Church, Columbus, introduced a vested choir of men and boys with a sung recessional. This was unusual in the Anglican Churches and unknown in Ohio. In his Diocesan address in 1868, he condemned the action taken. Surplices and vested processing choirs were not lawful, he maintained because of the rubric which said that the Minister should begin the Morning or Evening Prayer "by reading one or more of the following sentences" of Scripture. "It is vain", he said,

1. Perry, W. S., The History of the American Episcopal Church P. 46 ff.
2. Diocesan Journal of 1867 P. 19 ff.
   Smythe, Op. Cit. Appendix

"to argue that a hymn or psalm sung by some fifteen or twenty persons as they march the length of the Church with the whole congregation united with them, is the mode of worship contemplated in the rubric. Furthermore, surplices, being a distinctive dress of the officiating Clergy, may not be worn by a company of boys and men whose only distinction from the rest of the congregation is that they lead the singing."[1]

The Rev. Colin C. Tate, rector of St. Paul's, was not inclined to be guided by the Godly admonition of the Bishop and on April 19, 1869 the Standing Committee of the Diocese presented him for trial. Two attempts were made to hold the trial, but for various reasons both were abortive.

On Dec. 7, 1869, Mr. Tate addressed a letter to Bishop McIlvaine stating that since the singing procession disturbed the peace of the Church and seemed to put him in a position of insubordination he would discontinue its practices on the first Sunday of the New Year. He still believed he had violated no law of the Church and no vow of his ordination. The Bishop was slightfully doubtful about his good faith, because of the fact that he reserved the right to use processional singing for four more Sundays as well as on Christmas Day. However, on February of the following year the Standing Committee withdrew the presentment.[2]

1. Diocesan Journal of 1868 P. 25 ff. Smythe, Op.Cit. Appendix
2. Diocesan Journal of 1870 P. 51 Ibid.

One may see something comic about the whole proceeding, but it is to be remembered that the Bishop was standing for what he believed to be a certain principle and that anything that violated that principle should not be permitted. The unfamiliarity of processional singing in general made it seem objectional. It was practically unknown in England and little used.

The case of Dr. James Kent Stone was of a more serious character. Stone, who for several years had been a professor at Kenyon College was elected its president in 1867. He was a man of great personal popularity, brilliant and sometimes erratic and seems to have been profoundly affected by the Oxford Movement. Two of the professors at Bexley Hall, Drs. Bronson and McIlhenny charged him with erroneous teachings in his classrooms and in his sermons. Bishop McIlvaine and Bishop Bedell examined the theological position of Stone, and consequently Stone ultimately withdrew from the college. The result was grave dissention at Gambier; the college supported Stone against Bexley Hall and the trustees. The feelings between Bexley and the college were most bitter. "There are still Kenyon men of that period", writes Dr. Smythe, "who despite all the years and changes cannot feel very cordial towards Bexley Hall. Stone left to become president of Hobart College but at the end of one year entered the Roman Catholic Church and became a well known Mission Preacher, under the name of Father Fidelis."[1]

1. Smythe, Op. Cit. P 331 ff.

More contention followed but much of the brunt of it was borne by Bishop Bedell. Bishop McIlvaine did not attend the Convention but in an address which he sent mentioned the Evangelical Alliance the last two weeks of September, and trusted "there would be no lack of interest on the part of the American Episcopal Church." The Convention appointed a committee which reported a resolution remembering with gratitude Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr.[1] "This was expecting a good deal of the brethern" says Dr. Smythe, "to ask them to say that they gratefully remembered Bucer and Peter Martyr but the report was adopted by rather a close vote."

During this decade his letters show some of the same uncompromising attitudes toward ceremonial. They characterized his earlier positions. Writing to Canon Carus, Jan. 17, 1866, he said,

"I have constantly declared amidst all the confidence that Puseyism was dead, that it was strong, aggressive and dangerous as ever, that rationalism did not take its place but grew out of the soil it prepared, and that we need to watch against both. See in the preface to my 'Righteousness By Faith' the line of advance which the Roman Church makes against the Church of England is the same as here -- general display of ceremonial, music, crosses, vestments, processions, sacramentalisms-- working out our own righteousness by all such things, but all centering in Priest, Sac-

1. Diocesan Journal of 1870 P. 56 ff. Smythe, Op.Cit. Appendix

rifice and Altar.

I have long since published my determination not to consecrate a church having an altar-form structure. In one of my churches a cross of wood was put on such a structure. I would not enter it til they took the cross away, and I did not consecrate it till the structure was changed. Last November, I went to consecrate a church, having confidence, that as I had written about it I should find nothing in the way. An hour before service I went to see the Church. Lo! such a structure. I said at once, 'I cannot consecrate the Church.' The rector entreated me as there was no time to make a change and the congregation would soon be there. I consented on the condition that what was there should be covered out of sight, and a table substituted as soon as possible, which was done. It was the rector's fault. The people and the leading men who had built the Church were glad I took so decided a position."[1]

During these years of activity in the Diocese of Ohio McIlvaine was busy with many things outside the Diocese. He seemed to enjoy great respect for those who differed with him. Bishop John Williams, in 1868 wrote as follows:

"My dear Bishop,

Among all the pleasant things of this blessed season the pleasantest of all is your kind letter. I am sure that your good words....gave me a world of comfort for I am not conscious that I ever had any other feeling for

1. Carus, Op. Cit. P. 259 ff.

you than most sincere respect and then as of sincere love. I have often longed to say so to you that what Archbishop Parker called as 'sort of natural shamefacedness', and the feeling that you might say, 'What is that to me?' sealed my lips. I can only say that then and now my words are only the honest utterance of what I truly feel.....

J. Williams."[1]

1. Personal Letter, Bishop Williams to Bishop McIlvaine

CHAPTER FIVE

In many respects McIlvaine was at his best in his relationships with the Church of England, especially in his relationships with the Evangelical party. There were no questions of discipline to be settled. He was thoroughly at home in the English circles, both clerical and lay. He responded to the warmth of their welcome and affection. From the time of his first trip in 1830 he made frequent visits to England. He was nearly as well known in English Church circles as he was in the United States. During his first two visits to England no opportunity was open to him to preach. The first three decades of the last century, no clergyman of the American Church, not even a Bishop was allowed to preach in English pulpits. When this disability was removed, he preached both frequently and effectively. His contacts were among all kinds of people, but they seemed to have been primarily among the titled leaders of the Evangelical Party and among the Clergy. His contact with the Islington group seems to have been very close. His "Oxford Theology Compared" made a very favorable impression on many English Churchmen. On his second visit, in 1835 he was able to make contacts with a number of undergraduates at Oxford. From that time on no visits were made without some contacts with students.

The library at Kenyon proposed a congratulatory address, signed by a large number of Cambridge undergraduates affirming their affection for him. He recorded in his diary his first meeting with the Oxford group:

"The Friday night meetings at which Mr. Simeon was accustomed to receive at his rooms the young men of the University who were seriously disposed, hearing and answering questions on points of personal religion, were at that time, I forget for what reason, suspended. A meeting at the rooms of Mr. Carus at Trinity College, seemed to be their substitute. It was my privilege on Sunday evening to attend that meeting, and expound the Scriptures to about a hundred young men, assembled simply for the Word of God and prayer. A more simple-hearted, affectionate congregation, one that seemed to be more in the spirit of that which Peter found in the house of Cornelius when they said, 'Now are we all here present, before God to hear all things that are commanded of thee O God', I never beheld."[1]

It was during his visit to England that he was able to obtain thirty-five thousand dollars to erect Bexley Hall, the theological school of Kenyon college. His appeal was apparently to the Evangelical group which was stirred by the idea of having a center of Evangelical theological study. In 1853 the Bishop attended the Jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society as an American delegate. He was a guest of Bishop Sumner at Farnham Castle and preached the ordination sermon for the Bishop's candidates. He received the degree of D.C.L. at Oxford at the installation of the Earl of Derby, as Chancellor. The honorary degree was doubt-

1. Carus, Op. Cit. P 109

lessly a recognition of his leadership in the Evangelical cause.

In his report to the Convention, after his return, he describes the motive that led him to accept the invitation of the Bible Society:

"It seemed so important an opportunity of testifying the interest felt in our Church in the great work of the Church and Scripture circulation, especially in these days when the Wrath of Rome in warring with such revived determination against the reading of the Scriptures, and when so many influences are elsewhere at work from the side of the Rationalists as well as of the Romanizing Protestants to dethrone the Bible from its rightful position as the only rule of Faith and life, that I could not decline the appointment."[1]

Later he testified:

"To the unvaried, Christian kindness which I received from clergy and laity in all places, and the earnest desire manifested between our country and Britain and especially between our Church and England, the bonds of love and fellowship, may they be drawn closer and closer, more especially in view of the great struggle for Gospel truth and Liberty which is evidently drawing neigh - if we be not already in the midst of it - the struggle in which the Protestantism of both England and America must take so great a share."[2]

The Bishop kept in close touch with his friends in England

1. Carus, Op. Cit. P. 186
2. Diocesan Journal of 1853 Smythe, G. F., Op.Cit. Appendix

by mail. His letters with Canon Carus were frequent and full. In 1858 he returned again to England, preached at Cambridge University and received ad eundem the degree of D.C.L. It is significant that he preached on Revival. In January of 1859 was held the annual "Denial meeting" at Islington. The names of his fellow-attendants included Ryle, Cunningham, Bridges, Magee and others who later obtained great distinction in the Church of England. The Bishop spoke twice and felt that "the earnestness for a revival of God's Holy Word seemed very great. The Lord hear and send His Holy Spirit to the Churches."

The most important of his visits to England was that in connection with the "Unofficial Commission" at the time of the Civil War. With Thurlow Weed, the Bishop was appointed a commissioner to England at a time when conditions were crucial.

Ann Stevens Mc Nair, who has recently made a study of the "Unofficial Commission" makes the following statement:

"It has often been assumed that the Trent Affair was the occasion of the appointment of the Commission. This is a natural error inasmuch as the arrival of Weed and McIlvaine in England followed soon after the news of the Trent Affair. .....Smythe says, 'In 1861 when British opinion was greatly inflamed because of the Trent Affair, he again visited England at the request of President Lincoln and exerted himself particularly among the Clergy to make friends for the United States. Another writer states that in 1861 Weed went with Archbishop Hughes and Bishop McIlvaine to concil-

iate English and French opinion after the Trent Affair.....

The real reason for the Commission would seem to be that in the Fall of 1861, public opinion in England was already turning against the North. The loss of British sympathy for the North was already apparent to Secretary Seward and at the end of October, almost a month before Captain Wilkes intercepted the Trent, he decided to take action with regard to it. He realized that he needed representatives abroad to overcome the influences of the Confederate agents and the propaganda they had spread."[1]

It is not our purpose to discuss the details of the Unofficial Commission. The private letters of the Bishop, however, indicate how much the Bishop depended on Evangelical contacts for the fulfillment of his mission. It was true at that time that he had established many friendships which made his position rather easy.

He writes from Farnham Castle, December 23, 1851:

"I am here with my daughter once more with my venerable and kind friend for more than 25 years, the Bishop of Winchester. Yesterday in the chapel of the Castle, I preached for the third time a sermon at his ordinations. First in 1853, then in 1858,....the Sunday before I had preached in Trinity, Cambridge. I have plenty of applications to preach, a great many more than I can answer in the affirmative."[2]

In January of 1862 he again attended the Islington Con-

1. Stevens, Ann H., The Unofficial Commission to England 1861 P. 18 ff.
2. Private Letter to Bishop Bedell

ference. This gave him a fine opportunity to describe it to Bishop Bedell in the following terms:

"Danger of war with England had been averted....Next morning at half-past ten I met nearly 300 clergymen of the Church of England. It was the annual clerical meeting at which, in 1830 I was present for the first time in company with Dr. Milnor. In 1835 I again attended it, this as before in the spacious study of Daniel Wilson, then Vicar of Islington and the late Bishop of Calcutta. In 1859 I had again the privilege. This time it was in the Bishop Wilson Memorial Hall. It had grown from one hundred to three hundred clergymen, met together to spend a day in prayer and the hearing of the elucidations of Gospel truth on appointed subjects. It was a most important meeting, not only on account of what was taught, and the earnest prayers offered, but because of the high character and position of those present, and the extensive interest they exerted on the religious mind and public opinion of England. Many of them had heard the peace news before they came. Others heard it first at the meeting. As I entered my hands were taken by one and another with a glow of joy and thankfulness on each face....."[1]

As the months went on, the Bishop was in contact with nearly everyone of distinction in England. He never seems to have lost the Evangelical touch, however. Contacts with royalty and nobility were only a means to an end. Writing to his brother on March 14, 1862, he said,

1. Personal letter to Bishop Bedell (Jan. 1862)

"I was thoroughly fatigued by a day of speechifying and conversation. On all these occasions how often clergymen tell me of these blessings of God, on the reading of my books and tracts in England, sometimes to themselves, sometimes to their relatives and friends. My first charge, 'On Preaching Christ' I have heard so much of in that aspect; and my sermon at the consecration of Bishop Lee, 'Ministerial Responsibility', both are circulated widely in England. You will believe me when I say that when going about and meeting people....who come many miles to see me, my question is, 'What am I--what can they find that will not utterly disappoint them? It is all astonishing to me and I simply resolve it into some misconception about me. It humbles me before God, especially as it is a talent, whatever else it may be...to be improved under solemn responsibility for His Glory."[1]

The results of his presence in England are summarized by Smythe as follows:

"English people who met him were much impressed by Bishop McIlvaine. Here, once more was a Bishop of Ohio playing the great social role that his predecessors had played nearly forty years before, and felt by everyone to be a man of deep piety, as was the other. He was a person of much elegance of appearance; he had a commanding air which in England enhanced men's opinions of him though it did not always do that in Ohio. And he was a champion of Evangelical Faith which was widespread in the Church of England."[2]

1. Personal letter to Bishop Bedell (March 24th)
2. Smythe, Op.Cit. P 320 ff.

CHAPTER SIX

McIlvaine's first book, "Evidences of Christianity", consisted of his lectures delivered at the University of the City of New York. Classes of many hundreds gathered to hear these lectures.

The manner in which he treats the credibility and authenticity of the New Testament reflects his concept of the verbal inerrancy of Holy Scripture. He prefaces this belief by saying, "The authenticity and credibility of the other (the Old Testament) is rendered when the argument for the New Testament is set forth in conclusive form." Arguing from the standpoint of historical criticism, he maintains that "the age of a book" does not affect the evidence required to establish its authenticity.[1] In short, he says "an unbroken chain of testimony ascends from the present generation to the preceeding, and thence to the next beyond, and thence onward again, till it reaches the very age of the Apostles exhibiting an uninterrupted series of acknowledgements of the New Testament, as having been written indeed by those primitive disciples to whom its several parts are ascribed."[2]

Beginning with early, fourth Century scholarship, he shows the parallel between canonically accepted books of that time and those accepted at the time of his lectures and suggests that this proves the authenticity of each portion in question. He goes on to say that "in no book of the Holy

1. McIlvaine, C. P., Evidences of Christianity P. 46 ff.
2. Ibid, P. 47 f.

Volume are opinions professed that are contradictory to any which the reputed author is known elsewhere to have maintained; nor are facts recorded that happened later than the age in which he lived; nor is the style different from his other writings, or from what might reasonably have been expected from his pen."[1]

Reference is made to the still extant "Acts of Paul and Thecla" to show how the early Church dealt with the writers of spurious documents once they were revealed. "The attempt at imposition was charged upon the author and confessed. Whereupon he was degraded from office and the whole matter was notified to the Churches that they might feel the need of the stricktest care thereafter."[2] Undoubtedly, such an ideal method of policing the Scriptures as is suggested would tend to warrant taking such a stand as exemplified by Bishop McIlvaine's dissertation.

As to the credibility of Gospel history, Bishop McIlvaine argues that having proved its authenticity, its credibility is thereby established. He says, "If a book with all this within its favor (the veracity of its history as a whole) ought not to be believed historical truth, the possibility of ascertaining it must be given up....What would be thought of the intellect, not to be thought of the candor of the man who with all this before him, should take up the 'Memories of the Life of Augustus Caesar' as the above supposed, and not

1. McIlvaine, C. P., Op. Cit. P. 64
2. Ibid. P. 70

feel that it were the absurdest folly to question the accuracy of their statements?"[1]

That our Lord constantly appealed to the miracles for His credentials is maintained in the following section:

"In the New Testament we read that our Lord, Jesus Christ appeared before men as an ambassador of God...we must know the credentials of the Ambassador....we must have sufficient evidence that he was sent of God. Furnish this and we are bound to receive His communications."[2]

His position may be summarized as follows:

"The Savior and His Apostles did work miracles; there is nothing unreasonable in the idea of a miracle being wrought in proof of a divine revelation. If they were so wrought they can be rendered credible by no other evidence than that of testimony. The testimony and proof of miracles is still valid. The question may then be raised "Have we satisfactory evidence that genuine miracles were wrought by our Lord? Since the answer to this question is an affirmative one, miracles are to be accepted as genuine. If so the credentials of Christ and the Apostles must be acknowledged. They are then what they are commissioned to be--divinely inspired teachers."[3]

The defense of the Christian faith as thus presented is

1. McIlvaine, C. P., Op. Cit. P. 107
2. Ibid P. 127
3. Ibid P. 128 ff.

of the older type of apologetic.

There appear to have been two editions of "The Holy Catholic Church". The first, from which subsequent quotations are made, was published in 1844 at Philadelphia under the title of "The Holy Catholic Church or the Communion of Saints in the Mystical Body of Christ". Canon Carus refers to another published in 1861 entitled "The True Temple or Holy Catholic Church and Communion of Saints in its Nature, Structure and Unity". The quotations of Canon Carus are identical with portions of the 1844 edition.

The materials of the Church and the Temple of God are "none but the true people of God"....God dwells in none but those that love Him and receive His Spirit."[1] ...."The true Church of God to which belong all the Glorious privileges and Titles of God in Scripture, which is the pillar and ground of the Truth, and against which the Gates of Hell cannot prevail, that company cannot but be in proportion as it consists (as our good Hooker says on this head) of none but true Israelites, the true sons of Abraham, true servants and saints of God."[2]

In his appendix he is careful to distinguish the universal, visible Church and all particular ecclesiastical organizations. "The visible Church Universal is not the comprehension of all separate ecclesiastical organizations, but

1. McIlvaine, C.P., The Holy Catholic Church P. 16 ff.
2. Ibid P. 37

of all professing Christians."[1]

The circumstances of the publication of "Oxford Divinity" have been previously outlined. In the preface he states it to be his desire to revive the attention of the members of the Church, especially of her Clergy and Candidates for Holy Orders to the words of the older Divines of the Seventeenth Century such as Usher, Hall, Hopkins, Andrews and others as well as to those preceeding them up to the period of the Reformation; so that the nervous and clear displays of Divine Truth as therein abounding and as distinguished from the feeble and confused, and mixed mode of representing the way of Salvation, which characterized the more modern Anglican Divines should become more thoroughly studied and appreciated."[2]

The book itself, afterwards entitled "Righteousness by Faith" was a discussion of Justification and the conclusion that he made "presented a chain of Testimony from the Great Gospel doctrine of the Justification by the imputed Righteousness of Christ; that Righteousness consisting in Christian active obedience in fulfilling the Law as in His Passion in suffering His penalty; that righteousness applied, embraced or apprehended only by faith; and faith in this act, though necessarily a lively and working faith, and working by love, and yet not affectual in this application of Christ's Righteousness because it is a virtue or work of love, but simply

1. McIlvaine, C.P., The Holy Catholic Church P. 68
2. McIlvaine, C. P., Oxford Divinity (Preface)

because it is the empty hand of an unworthy beggar reaching out unto and taking hold on Christ."[1]

A number of the Bishop's sermons were published as was a paper on "The Rationalism of Essays and Reviews" which was printed by order of the House of Bishops. The Bishop described it himself as follows: "A pronunciamento on the character of the doctrines taught and the status of men holding such views and continuing to hold their places as ministers under the doctrinal standards of the Church of England."[2]

It was an attempt to suggest that in view of the danger arising from such teaching the American Church ought to express itself. It may well be seen by these exerpts that McIlvaine's teaching was traditionally and soundly protestant. He was a careful thinker and wrote with ease and clarity.

1. Carus, William, Op. Cit. P. 392 appendix
2. Ibid, appendix

CHAPTER SEVEN

The closing years of Bishop McIlvaine's life were happy ones as were his associations with Bishop Bedell. In 1873 Bishop Bedell wrote "my assistantship per se,--my relations to him -- have been an uninterrupted source of enjoyment. I do not now remember a single occasion on which we found differences in views either in Diocesan or general policy." He quoted Bishop Bedell as saying, that as bishops they had worked harmoniously, lovingly, deferently, without jealousy.

There must have been some sadness, however, in these later years. The defection of Bishop Cummings, former assistant Bishop of Kentucky, who left to found the Reformed Episcopal Church must have caused him great unhappiness. This schism was finally consummated in 1873 but the matter had been agitated for a number of years previous. There were no defections in the Diocese of Ohio during Bishop McIlvaine's life, although subsequently two separate congregations were formed. As long as he had the strength, the Bishop continued to make his visitations. He attended the first Lambeth Conference in 1868 although he was not very much impressed with the conference. He left with the impression that the feeling of the whole meeting, the bearing of all towards one another, the decidedly high tone of manners and spirit were delightful. "I could heartily unite in the last resolution to give thanks to God, as we all did."[1]

He was in England again in 1870 in the Fall, and in 1871

1. Carus, William, Op. Cit. P. 283

was a member of a delegation appointed to visit the Czar of Russia on behalf of the persecuted protestants in the Baltic Provinces. The Czar was at Fredrichshafen on Lake Constance, and it was there that the delegation went. The Czar delegated Prince Gortshakoff to receive them. The results of this were not particularly definite, but at least they were received with respect and dignity.

In 1872, during the month of May, he set sail for Europe and sensing his probable inability to return again to his own diocese he bade his people a solemn farewell. After his arrival in England, he received many extraordinary attentions. The fruit of many years of friendship came to him in the form of invitations and opportunities of all types. The Prince of Wales whom he had entertained in Cincinnati sometime before entertained him at the palace and aboard the Royal Yatch. In addition, the Queen invited him to Osborne in company with the American Minister and General Sherman.

In January, 1873, with Canon and Mrs. Carus he went to Florence expecting to go on to Rome and Naples. He was seized with a severe chill which was followed by violent inflamation of the lungs. Recovery seemed impossible, and he received the announcement that there was no hope with perfect calmness and religious faith. To Canon Carus he said, "I know that I am dying, but I have no care -- the Lord is my Shepherd; he lifts up the light of His countenance upon me -- I wish to lie in His hands and He will do with me what He will with me -- It is dishonor to Christ to be afraid."[1]

1. Carus, William, Op.Cit. P. 356

He died on the 12th of March and the first funeral service was held by Canon Carus in the English Church in Florence. The body was conveyed to England, and on the eve of Easter Monday was brought to Westminister Abbey where in the Chapel of St. Faith it rested in state four days. On April 18th a solemn service was held with Dean Stanley officiating. The body was brought, subsequently, to New York; and the service was held in St. Paul's Chapel, in which he had been consecrated.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Three estimates of his work may suffice to suggest his contribution to the Evangelical Spirit; two from his contemporaries and one from a more modern source.

Bishop Bedell, his beloved assistant, evaluated his work as follows:

"But he labored that what are known as Evangelical principles should prevail, and that diversities therefrom should never exceed the liberty of our standards. He labored that all parishes and all Clergy should conform to all outward observances, as ruled by the canons and liturgy, and neither by defect nor by excess, violate external unity and order. He succeeded to a degree which might almost be claimed as complete. That irregularities should sometimes occur on either side was unavoidable. But he held the rule with inflexible and even justice. Nor when he laid down his work, was he aware -- nor was I with some favorable opportunities of forming an opinion, today aware of any irregularity either by defect or by excess, which cannot be covered fairly by allowable liberty of interpretation. Any attempt to pass beyond this reasonable limit he probably and always repressed.....

His method of maintaining doctrinal integrity, and integrity in ecclesiastical law was to discuss variations from his own view, frankly, fully and with an earnestness that showed his sense of the importance of the topics....On the gravest occasions he entered into the arena of public con-

troversy. His logical acumen here exhibited itself, accompanied by such a thorough mastery of all the elements belonging to the topic and such force in presenting them that his conclusions were invariably accepted by the diocese, and generally by the Church. In a discussion of the greatest moment, arising out of the publication of the Oxford Tracts, the calm decision of the Church at large, after years of reflection has undoubtedly affirmed the Bishop's judgment and vindicated his foresight.....

His greatest power in the pulpit was dedicated to the manifestation of the Gospel, during all his visitations to the parishes. His main topics were Redemption, the need of it, the mode of it. How he rung the changes on that chime! Ever varied, ever the same; the melodies many the harmonies one; the one thought, Jesus Christ and Him Crucified. The range which it covered was as large as every spiritual need and every doctrine which it illustrates or defines. His special themes were the ruin of our nature by sin and the Atonement - the vicarious sacrifice of Christ. His remarkably clear conceptions of these two foundation truths of the Gospel scheme gave a character to his preaching very much like that of St. Paul."[1]

Bishop Dan Huntington made a statement to his Convention in 1873 that is particularly apt:

"His Episcopate covered almost half the existance of our Church in the United States. Inheriting Scotch blood,

1. Carus, William, Op.Cit. P. 364 ff.

his mental constitution bore the marks of that ancestry in his theological genius, and his taste and ability in dogmatics as well as in his strong, personal will. Gifted with a quick and capacious understanding, moving always with the dignified and graceful mien of a noble person, and lifted into universal respect by his ardent piety, it might not be fanciful to trace in him some characteristics of his national descent- something of the evangelical unction of Leighton, of the sanctity of Erskine, of the directness of Rutherford and even the courage of Knox. To these traits he certainly joined many that go to make up a patriotic and active American."[1]

The estimate of Dr. Smythe, Historian of the Diocese of Ohio, as to Bishop McIlvaine's contribution, should be included.

"In a period when great changes were rife in doctrine and ritual, it was inevitable that he, a man of strong convictions and dominant nature, should be involved in a controversy. Our history shows him often in conflict and this is the impression of him that has been most lasting in Ohio. He fought what he believed to be the good fight of faith, and never for one hour forgot his solemn promise to banish and drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word, and diligently to exercise such discipline as was committed to him. But all those doctrines and practices that seemed so erroneous and strange

1. Carus, William, Op.Cit. P. 369

have gained a right to live and even to flourish in Ohio, and that particular form of doctrine which he and the great majority of his Clergy thought to be the very and only saving faith, is now held if at all only by a few aged people here and there. In almost every Episcopal Church in Ohio there are teachings and practices that he would have viewed with horror and would have restrained by every source of discipline. But if from this we were to draw the inference that he wrought nothing permanent into the Church in Ohio, we should be mistaken. His influence still works powerfully. To his determined opposition to the sacramental doctrines of the Tractarian Movement, must in large measure, be attributed the fact that those doctrines have never found the acceptance in Ohio that they have found further west, and that although in Ohio Church ceremonial has been largely from impulses that grew out of Tractarianism, still for the most part no important doctrinal meaning is generally attached to these new forms.

Bishop McIlvaine was a man whose very appearance and bearing marked him an eminent person and created in advance an expectation that what he might say would be of weight; and when he spoke the clearness of his thoughts, the impressiveness of his delivery justified in the minds of his hearers all their expectation. He had the reputation of being a great preacher, and wherever he went people of all denominations crowded to hear him; his evangelical doctrines were those that they had heard preached in their own Churches,

and his fervor stirred their souls. For nearly forty years, in all parts of the state, he held the attention of great congregations as probably no other preacher has ever held it for such a length of time. Yet Bishop McIlvaine was thoroughly and uncompromisingly an Episcopalian."[1]

From this brief study of Bishop McIlvaine's life, several things may be said regarding his contributions to the American Church.

Although the Evangelical Movement had been well established in Europe before McIlvaine's time it should be remembered that through the effort of the Bishop its thought became clarified and it received an Episcopal emphasis heretofore unknown, in the United States. As we know, our country was not without its spiritual lethargy. As the great masses of people migrated westward toward the "Frontier", Christianity lagged in the wake of their migration. However, by 1812 it is reported that there were 30,000 Methodists in the far west and by 1830 the total number of Methodists, in the United States amounted to 175,000 members. Relatively speaking, the Protestant Episcopal Church was far behind in both membership and clergy. The Baptists and Presbyterians were far more active, also, as the expansion of colonization reached to the South and West.

The Evangelical Movement came to life at an opportune moment. Although it had a staunch supporter, in Bishop

1. Smythe, G. F., Op. Cit. P. 344 ff.

Griswold, and in various Clergy, in the early Nineteenth century, its greatest activity came with Bishop McIlvaine, in the Missionary Diocese of Ohio. Under his leadership, there was added to the American Church a new and vital emphasis of Evangelicalism, which up to this time had been more or less only an ideal in the minds of the Low Church group.

For many, McIlvaine clarified the meaning of the term Low Churchman. Although the basis of his teaching was broad in nature, he was certain that the principles and institutions which distinguished the Church were primitive, "derived from the Apostles, and of the same origin as the Bible.... and a full warrant for our standing as a separate denomination, 'til all others become Episcopal'".

Today, this statement, as it stands, should prove to be of value to both High and Low Churchmen. Certainly, it has been said before by both parties, but rarely has its teaching remained pure and undiluted, by either extreme. The character of his teaching and conviction should be an object lesson. If such a thing is possible, the Bishop taught with conviction and without bias. Although he preached almost continuously about the state of Grace following conversion he was always the first to admit that he was an "unworthy sinner,....in the sight of God a most miserable bishop."

Although the Evangelical Movement in Anglicanism was marked by some indifference to scholarship, this was hardly

the case in the American Church. At first doctrine may have been taught without qualification, but under the guidance of Bishop McIlvaine, the peak of scholarship reached a new and commanding level.

Regarding the Catholic revival of ceremonial McIlvaine feared, apparently, the infiltration of Roman Catholicism. There is strong evidence, as is pointed out in chapter one, that the Evangelical Movement emerged from certain doctrinal aspects of Christianity, rather than from an aversion to ceremonial, as such. By the same token, it seems likely that Sacramentalism may have been neglected by the Evangelicals, because of its association with ceremony in Catholicism; hence the tendency toward subjectivism in worship and the necessary emphasis on "inner conversion".

Although McIlvaine's position seems extreme today, it played a necessary role at that time. Protestantism in the American Church was retained and fortified. At the same time, Protestantism in general, looked to Bishop McIlvaine as "the champion of Evangelicals". By an interacting process, Protestant denominations and the Episcopal Church exchanged with one another, something of each other's genius. The modern Protestant trend toward objective forms of worship attests this fact.

Many of the Bishop's idiosyncrasies were of little consequence when compared to such things as his humility of spirit and his consecration to a task that caused him great

anxiety. He was conscious of the fact that the religious life of children had been neglected in the American Church so he set about organizing Sunday Schools in the diocese of Ohio and before long there were more pupils enrolled in Church schools than there were communicants in the diocese.

The writer is inclined to agree with B. Z. Stambaugh who says, "Scotland has produced many theologians, but few saints. The second Bishop of Ohio was a Scot and a theologian; but he was also a saint."[1] Although Scottish only by inheritance, he was a worthy representative of the Scotch intellectual tradition and an example of outstanding uncompromising moral and spiritual character.

1. B. Z. Stambaugh, "The McIlvaine Episcopate" Historical Magazine Sept.(1937) 300.

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allen, A.V.G. Life and Letters of Phillips Brooks Vol's 1 & 2 New York: Button and Co., 1900

2. Carus, William. Memorials of Charles Pettit McIlvaine New York: Whittaker, 1882

3. Cornish, F. Warre. A History of the English Church Vol's 1 &2 London: Macmillian and Co., 1910

4. Green, John R. A Short History of the English People New York: Burt and Co.

5. Lee, Alfred. In Memoriam Cleveland: Leader Printing Co., 1873

6. Manross, William W. A History of the American Episcopal Church New York: Morehouse, 1935

7. McIlvaine, Charles Pettit. Correspondence of Bishop C. P. McIlvaine

8. " " " Evidences of Christianity Philadelphia: Smith and English, 1857

9. " " " The Holy Catholic Church Philadelphia: H. Hooker, 1844

10. " " " Oxford Divinity 1862

11. " " " Select Family and Parish Sermons Columbus: Isaac Whiting, 1839

12. Binns, Leonard E. The Evangelical Movement in the English Church, Garden City: Doubleday, Doran, 1928

13. Overton, J. H. and Relton, F. The English Church London: Mcmillian and Co.,1906

14. Patterson, M.W. A History of The Church of England London: Longman's Green 1909

15. Perry, William S. The Episcopate in America New York: Christian Literature Co. 1895

16. " " " The History of the American Episcopal Church, Boston: Osgood and Co., 1895

17. Shimerall, R. C. End of Prelacy
New York: Scribners 1851

18. Smythe, George F. A History of the Diocese of Ohio
Cleveland: Diocesan Press, 1931

19. Stambaugh, B. Z., The McIlvaine Episcopate,
Historical Magazine
IX (1937) 300-307

20. Stevens, Ann H., "The Unofficial Commission to England"
Unpublished Master's Thesis,
Occidental College, Los Angeles, 1937.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

The following is an extract from a clipping taken from "The Standard of the Cross" and signed by one Ethan Allen; it is the only complete and available list of the publications of Bishop McIlvaine:

1822 Reply to Bishop Kemp
The Worth of a Soul
Address on Temperance
Spiritual Declension
1824 The Washington Miracle Refuted
1821-24 Articles in the Washington Theological Repertory
1827 Sermon before the D. C. Educational Society
1832 Evidences of Christianity
1833 Letters to Dr. Tyng
1834 First Charge - Preaching Christ Crucified
Extracts from His Journal
Self-Examination - on Repentance
1834 Correspondence with Bishop Chase
1835 Sermon before the Board of Missions
1836 Second Charge - "Condition and Want of the Church"
1837 Baccalaureate Sermon at Gambier
1838 Melville's Sermons (Edited and Prefaced)
Letters on Confirmation
Select Family and Parish Sermons
Sermon at the Consecration of Bp. Polk in Cincinnati
Thanksgiving Sermon - Necessity of Religion to the Nation
1839 Sermon - Origin and Design of the Christian Ministry
Address at the Laying of Cornerstone of Bexley Hall
Letter to a Beneficiary
1840 Third Charge - Justification by Faith
1841 Oxford Divinity
Rome and Geneva
Letter to Rev. Dr. Seabury (in Gambier Paper)
1843 Fourth Charge - Chief Danger of the Church
An Earnest Word for Gambier
1844 The Holy Catholic Church
Reply to President Douglass
Letter to Bp. B. T. Onderdonk (in Gambier Paper)
1846 Reasons for not consecrating a Church with an Altar
1848 Sermon before the Evangelical Knowledge Society
1850 Sermon at the consecration of Bp. Upfolf of Indiana
1851 No Priest, No Sacrifice, No Altar but Christ
Fifth Charge - Spiritual Regeneration
1852 Letter to Philadelphia (Banner of the Cross)
1853 Sermon to General Convention
1854 Sermon at Consecration of St. John's Church, Cincinnati
The Truth and Life
1855 Pastoral Letter Confirmation, Church Music
1856 "The Opinion of the Clergy of Grace Church, Cleveland
1857 Correspondence with Dr. Bolles
1858 Address before the American Tract Society

APPENDIX A (continued)

1859 Explanation of Ordination Sermon of 1839
1860 Sermon on Thanksgiving Day
The Temple of God
Sermon - The Tender Mercy of God
1861 Thoughts on Baptismal Regeneration
The Church in its Final Unity
Righteousness by Faith
Address on Dr. Brooke's death
Address at the funeral of President Andrewes
1863 Sixth Charge - The Work of Preaching Christ
1865 Address - Church Union Society
1868 Sermon at the Consecration of Calvary Church, Clifton
1869 Sermon at the opening of the New St. Ann's Brooklyn
Letter on Verbal Difficulties of Prayer Book(Standard of Cross)
Letter on the failure of the Tate Trial "
Letter on the Roman General Council "
1870 Letter on the boasted Unity of the Roman Churches "
Three addresses at the Clifton Conference,England "
1871 A New Year's Salutation to the Diocese "
1872 A Letter on the Baptismal Controversy "
Letter on the late General Convention "
The Contrast - A narrative of 1855 "
The Alms Basin Presentation, St. Paul's London "
A Christmas Salutation to his Diocese "
A New Year's Greeting to the Editor of the Standard of the Cross.

GTU Library
3 2400 00686 0765

W. H. SMITH
Book Binders
593 - 15th ST.
OAKLAND, CALIF.

LIBRARY USE ONLY